

**R e m a r k s**

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Fellman et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,246,702, hereinafter "Fellman."

Claims 5, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fellman as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Lehr et al. U.S. Patent 4,005,266, hereinafter "Lehr."

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fellman as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Lundh et al. U.S. Patent 6,373,834, hereinafter "Lundh."

Each of the various rejections and objections are overcome by amendments that are made to the specification, drawing, and/or claims, as well as, or in the alternative, by various arguments that are presented.

Any amendments to any claim for reasons other than as expressly recited herein as being for the purpose of distinguishing such claim from known prior art are not being made with an intent to change in any way the literal scope of such claims or the range of equivalents for such claims. They are being made simply to present language that is better conforms to the form requirements of Title 35 of the United States Code or is simply clearer and easier to understand than the originally presented language. Any amendments to any claim expressly made in order to distinguish such claim from known prior art are being made only with an intent to change the literal scope of such claim in the most minimal way, i.e., simply to avoid the prior art in a way that leaves the claim novel and not obvious in view of the cited prior art, and no equivalent of any subject matter remaining in the claim is intended to be surrendered.

Also, because a dependent claim inherently includes the recitations of the claim or chain of claims from which it depends, it is submitted that the scope and content of any dependent claims that have been herein rewritten in independent form is exactly the same as the scope and content of those claims prior to having been rewritten in independent form. That is, although by convention such rewritten claims are labeled herein as having been "amended," it is submitted that only the format, and not the content, of these claims

has been changed. This is true whether a dependent claim has been rewritten to include expressly the limitations of those claims on which it formerly depended or whether an independent claim has been rewritten to include the limitations of claims that previously depended from it. Thus, by such rewriting no equivalent of any subject matter of the original dependent claim is intended to be surrendered. If the Examiner is of a different view, he is respectfully requested to so indicate.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Fellman. The rejection is traversed.

Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. Fellman fails to disclose each and every element of Applicant's claimed invention. More specifically, Fellman does not teach or suggest "adapting operation of the clock of each of said other terminals," as recited in independent claim 1.

The Examiner asserts that given the broadest reasonable interpretation of the "operation of the clock" element, "the method of sending a correction offset value back to the corresponding slave device is considered as the same function as clock operation change" as described by the present Application. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Fellman discloses a synchronization mechanism that may compensate for propagation delay and equalize the phase delay between master and slave devices at the device level (see col. 15, lines 33-37; col. 16, lines 4-8). To synchronize master and slave devices, offsets between the master clock and each of the slave clocks are calculated and used to modify a routine for scheduling packets transmissions from the slave devices. For example, Fellman discloses that "the arrival of the fine resolution synchronization signal at a device adapter triggers a phase-synchronization event at said device adapter, adjusting the next frame boundary if necessary to coincide with the arrival time of the fine resolution synchronization signal plus the nominal duration of the frame" (see col. 7, lines 60-65). However, Fellman does not alter how the master and/or slave clocks operate. The clocks continue performing in the same manner.

In contrast, Applicants claim 1 expressly recites that to synchronize the master and slave clocks, operation of the slave clock itself is adapted. For example, as described in one embodiment of the original specification, representative pulses of the slave clocks are shifted proportionally to the determined round trip delay (page 11, line 10 – page 12, line 6). Similarly, the rates of the slave clocks may be increased or decreased depending on the rate of the master clock (page 12, lines 18-20). These are clock operation changes, not scheduling changes disclosed in Fellman.

Sending a correction offset value to a slave device to modify a transmission schedule is entirely different from altering operation of a clock itself. Nowhere in the cited portions does Fellman disclose altering clock operation in any manner. Rather, Fellman merely alters a packet transmission process using information provided by clocks. Therefore, Fellman fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, as arranged in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Fellman and is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102. Independent claim 7 recites relevant limitations similar to those recited in independent claim 1, and thus, for at least for the same reasons as discussed above, this independent claim also is not anticipated by Fellman and is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Because all of the dependent claims depending from the independent claims include all the limitations of the respective independent claim from which they ultimately depend, each such dependent claim is also allowable over Fellman.

Therefore, Applicants' claims 1-4, 6, 7, and 10 are allowable over Fellman under 35 U.S.C. §102. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 5, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fellman as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Lehr. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fellman as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Lundh. The rejections are traversed.

Each of these grounds of rejection applies only to dependent claims, and each is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 given Fellman. Because

the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 given Fellman has been overcome, as described hereinabove, and there is no argument put forth by the Office Action that the additional references supply that which is missing from Fellman to render the independent claims anticipated, these grounds of rejection cannot be maintained.

Therefore, Applicants' claims 5, 8, and 9 are allowable over Fellman in view of Lehr under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and claim 11 is allowable over Fellman in view of Lundh. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

**Conclusion**

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, the Examiner is invited to call Eamon Wall at (732) 530-9404 so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7/9/08



---

Eamon J. Wall  
Registration No. 39,414  
Attorney for Applicants

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP  
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100  
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702  
Telephone: 732-530-9404  
Facsimile: 732-530-9808